OIPE JC16
DEC 09 2004
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

AF

# *IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE*

| | |
|---|---|
| In re application of: Iremonger et al. | Attorney Docket No.: CLARP026/P2425 |
| Application No.: 09/378,526 | Examiner: YUAN, Almari Romero |
| Filed: August 20, 1999 | Group: 2176 |
| Title: ASSISTANT FOR CREATION OF LAYOUTS OR REPORTS FOR DATABASES | Confirmation No.: 9248 |

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail on December 6, 2004 in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signed: Lara M. Nelson
Lara M. Nelson

## APPEAL BRIEF TRANSMITTAL
## (37 CFR 192)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on October 5, 2004. This brief is transmitted in triplicate.

This application is on behalf of

☐ Small Entity ☒ Large Entity

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(f), the fee for filing the Appeal Brief is:
☐ $170.00 (Small Entity) ☒ $340.00 (Large Entity)

☐ Applicant(s) hereby petition for a _____ extension(s) of time to under 37 CFR 1.136.

If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefor.

☐ An extension for months has already been secured and the fee paid therefor of $ is deducted from the total fee due for the total months of extension now requested.

☒ Applicant(s) believe that no (additional) Extension of Time is required; however, if it is determined that such an extension is required, Applicant(s) hereby petition that such an

extension be granted and authorize the Commissioner to charge the required fees for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 to Deposit Account No. 500388.

Total Fee Due:

| | |
|---|---|
| Appeal Brief fee | $340.00 |
| Extension Fee (if any) | $ |
| Total Fee Due | $340.00 |

☒ Enclosed is Check No. 24746 in the amount of $340.00.

☒ Charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500388, (Order No. CLARP026).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300

OIPE JC156
DEC 09 2004
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS

---

**EX PARTE Iremonger et al.**

---

**Application for Patent**

**Filed August 20, 1999**

**Application No. 09/378,526**

**FOR:**

**ASSISTANT FOR CREATION OF LAYOUTS OR REPORTS FOR DATABASES**

---

**APPEAL BRIEF**

---

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail on December 6, 2004 in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signed: Lara M. Nelson
Lara M. Nelson

12/10/2004 ZJUHAR1 00000042 09378526

01 FC:1402 340.00 OP

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

12/10/2004 ZJUHAR1 00000026 09378526

01 FC:1401 ~~340.00 OP~~

Void date: 12/10/2004 ZJUHAR1
12/10/2004 ZJUHAR1 00000026 ~~09378526~~
01 FC:1401 ~~-340.00 OP~~

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | | Page No. |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. | REAL PARTY IN INTEREST | | 1 |
| II. | RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES | | 1 |
| III. | STATUS OF CLAIMS | | 1 |
| IV. | STATUS OF AMENDMENTS | | 1 |
| V. | SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER | | 2 |
| VI. | GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL | | 8 |
| VII. | ARGUMENT | | 7 |
| | A) | Rejection of claims 1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-38 under 35 USC § 103(a) | 7 |
| | B) | Rejection of claims 39-43 under 35 USC § 103(a) | 10 |
| | C) | Cross reference to the related application section in the specification | 13 |
| | D) | Conclusion | 14 |
| VIII. | CLAIMS APPENDIX | | 15 |

## I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Apple Computers, Inc., the assignee of the present application.

## II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The undersigned is not aware of any related appeals and/or interferences.

## III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-43 remain pending in the application. Claims 13-14, 24-25 and 35 have been cancelled during prosecution.

All of the pending claims (1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-43) stand rejected under 25 USC §103(a). Claims 1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Habraken, Joe, "Using Lotus SmartSuite Millennium Edition," 09/1998, Que Corporation, pages 337-340, and pages 411-425 (hereinafter "*Lotus*") in view of *Wright, Jr.* (U.S. patent No. 5,704,029 – issued 12/1997 hereinafter "*Wright*"), (Final Office Action, page 3). Claims 39-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Lotus* and *Wright*, further in view of Meadhra et al., "Lotus SmartSuite Millennium Edition for Dummies," 1998, IDG Worldwide, Inc., pages 240-252 (hereinafter "*Meadhra*") (Final Office Action, page 11).

All of the pending claims (1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-43) are appealed in this brief.

## IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The applicants filed an Amendment After Final in response to the Final Office Action dated May 6, 2004. No claims were amended in the Amendment After Final. However, the cross reference section of the specification was amended to provide the application number for a related U.S. patent application. It is earnestly believed that the Amendment After Final has not been entered. As indicated in the Advisory Action dated September 20, 2004, "request for reconsideration has been considered," but does NOT deem to place the application in condition for allowance.

## V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present invention relates to databases, and more particularly, to visual presentation of information stored in databases using a database program (or assistant).

Generally, databases are used to store data in a manner that facilitates subsequent use of the data. A database includes one or more files, each of which contains one or more records. A record holds information about a subject or item in various fields of the record. Often database programs provide a user interface that allows a user to view the data in various ways. For example, the visual representations can include browse mode, layout mode, and preview mode. The browse mode allows records to be viewed, changed, sorted, deleted, or added. The layout mode allows one to define how the information of the database is presented on a computer screen or in printed reports. The preview mode allows one to see on a computer screen how data in records, forms or reports will look when printed. Figures 1-3 of the present application are representative screen depictions from a conventional database program, namely, FileMaker Pro 4.0 by FileMaker Pro, Inc. of Santa Clara, California (Specification, Background of the Invention).

Broadly speaking, the invention pertains to an assistant for the creation of layouts/reports for databases. The assistant can be provided in a database program and serves to automate the creation of the layout/reports after an interview sequence with a user. Moreover, the assistant provides additional features which will be described with reference to the claimed invention (Specification, Summary of the Invention).

A concise explanation of subject matter defined in each of the independent claims is provided below.

### Independent claim 1

A method for creating a report or layout for data stored in a database, said method comprising:

(a) performing an interview sequence, by a database program, to obtain organization information associated with the database, the organization information including at least a list of fields defined for the database and at least one summary field for the report or layout, the at least one summary field being

associated with at least one of the fields in the list of field, wherein the database program is capable of accessing the data stored in the database, and wherein the interview sequence comprises determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout; and

Independent claim 1 pertains to a method for creating a report or layout for data stored in a database. Initially, an interview sequence is performed by a database program to obtain organization information associated with the database. It should be noted that the database program is capable of accessing data which has been stored in the database. The organization information includes: at least a list of fields defined for the database and at least one summary field for the report or layout which is associated with at least one of the fields in the list of field. Exemplary layout parts that may be obtained as organized information during the interview sequence include: Title Header, Header, Leading Grand Totals, Leading Summaries (or Leading Subsummaries), Body, Trailing Summaries (or Trailing Subsummaries), Trailing Grand Totals, Footer, and Title Footer (See, for example, TABLE 1, Specification, page 7).

Moreover, the interview sequence comprises determining: whether a script should be generated for the report or layout. As noted in the specification, a layout/report enhancement processing 550 can automatically create a script for the layout/report during its creation so that the layout/report can be easily initiated for subsequent data sets to be placed in the layout/report. In particular, a decision (554) can determines whether a script is requested. When the decision (554) determines that a script is requested, then the script is created (556) for the layout/report (Specification, page 11, lines 3-11; and Fig. 5C).

(b) automatically creating, by the database program, the report or layout based on the organization information obtained by the database program through the interview sequence (Claim 1)

After the interview sequence has been performed, the database program, automatically creates a report or layout based on the organization information obtained by the database program through the interview sequence. Figure 4 of the present application depicts a flow diagram of an exemplarily layout/report wizard processing (400) according to one embodiment of the invention. As shown in Figure 4, an interview sequence of the layout/report wizard is performed (406). The interview sequence operates to interview the user of the layout/report wizard to present the user with various options and selections to be made so as to produce the desired layout or report.

After the interview sequence has been performed (406), the layout/report can be created (408) (Specification, page 6, lines 9-28).

(c) automatically generating the script by the database program when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated, wherein the script when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based on the interview sequence (claim 1)

In addition to automatically generating the report or layout based on the interview sequence, the database program automatically generates a script when it is determined during the interview sequence that a script should be generated. As noted above, the interview sequence comprises determining: whether a script should be generated for the report or layout. Again, please note that the script when executed allows another report or layout to be subsequently generated based on the same interview sequence. Thus, the script allows automatically generating a report or layout based on the organized information obtained during the interview without having to perform the interview sequence again.

**Independent claim 17**

A method for creating a report layout for data stored in a database, said method comprising:

(a) performing an interview sequence, by a database program, to obtain organization information, the organization information including at least a list of fields and at least one summary field for the report layout, the at least one summary field being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields, the report layout including a plurality of parts including a header area, a grand total area, a summary area, a body area, and a footer area, wherein the database program is capable of accessing the data stored in the database, and wherein the interview sequence comprises determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout; and

(b) automatically creating the report layout based on the interview sequence, said creating includes placing the summary field in at least one of the grand total area and the summary area, and placing the fields in the list of fields in the body area and;

(c) automatically generating the script when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated, wherein the script when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based the interview sequence.

As can be seen, the recited features of independent claim 17 are similar to the limitations of the independent system claim 1, discussed above. Claim 17, however, additionally recites that the report layout includes: a header area, a grand total area, a

summary area, a body area, and a footer area. As noted above, Exemplary layout parts that may be obtained as organized information during the interview sequence include: Title Header, Header, Leading Grand Totals, Leading Summaries (or Leading Subsummaries), Body, Trailing Summaries (or Trailing Subsummaries), Trailing Grand Totals, Footer, and Title Footer (See, for example, TABLE 1, Specification, page 7).

Claim 17 also recites that automatic creation of the report layout based on the interview sequence includes: placing the summary field in at least one of the grand total area and the summary area, and placing the fields in the list of fields in the body area. It should be noted that the list of fields are included in the organization information obtained during the interview sequence. Also, please note that Figures 5A and 5B depict a flow diagram for creating layout/report processing (500) which can be used to place a summary field in a grand total area (e.g., 516, 534) and/or in a summary area (e.g., 520, 530) in the layout. Figure 5B also depicts placing a field in the list of fields in a body area (e.g. 524, 526) (Specification, page 8-10).

**Independent claim 31**

A computer readable medium including computer program code for a database program that is capable of creating a report layout for data stored in a database, said computer readable medium comprising:

computer program code for performing an interview sequence to obtain organization information, the organization information including at least a list of fields, the report layout including a plurality of parts including a header area, a grand total area, a summary area, a body area, and a footer area, wherein the database program is capable of accessing the data stored in the database, and wherein the interview sequence comprises determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout;

computer program code for creating the report layout based on the interview sequence, the creating of the report layout includes placing the fields in the list of fields in the body area; and

computer program code for automatically generating the script when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated, wherein the script when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based the interview sequence.

Independent claim 31 pertains to a computer readable medium including computer program code for a database program that is capable of creating a report layout for data stored in a database. Claim 31 is a *Beauregard* claim the recites similar

features as those described above with respect to claim 1 and 17. For this reason, no further explanation of the features of claim 31 will be provided in this section.

## VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

(a) Claims 1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Habraken, Joe, "Using Lotus SmartSuite Millennium Edition," 09/1998, Que Corporation, pages 337-340, and pages 411-425 (hereinafter "*Lotus*") in view of U.S. patent No. 5,704,029 (*Wright*) (Final Office Action, page 3).

(b) Claims 39-43 have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Lotus* in view of *Wright* and "Lotus SmartSuite Millennium Edition for Dummies," 1998, IDG Worldwide, Inc., pages 240-252 (hereinafter "*Meadhra*") (Final Office Action, page 11).

## ARGUMENTS

**A) Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

Independent claims 1, 17 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lotus* in view of U.S. patent No. 5,704,029 (*Wright*) (Final Office Action, page 3). This rejection is fully traversed below for at least the following reasons.

**(i) The claimed feature of determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout during an interview sequence has NOT been addressed in the Final Office Action**

Independent claims 1, 17 and 31 recite: "wherein the interview sequence comprises determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout." It is respectfully submitted that the Final Office Action does NOT address the claimed feature of: determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout during an interview sequence (claims 1, 17 and 31). Accordingly, it is very respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 31 is improper and should be withdrawn.

**(ii) Neither *Lotus*, nor *Wright* teach or suggest: determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout during an interview sequence**

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that neither *Lotus*, nor *Wright* teach or suggest this feature. As will be discussed below, *Wright* does NOT teach or suggest generating a script that when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based on the interview sequence. As such, there can be NO motivation or suggestion in *Wright* to teach: determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout during an interview sequence.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is very respectfully submitted that the field script of *Wright* does NOT teach a script that when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based on the interview sequence. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Wright* cannot possibly teach or even remotely suggest this feature because *Wright* does NOT even pertain to a method for creating a report or a layout for data stored in a database.

As will be discussed below, *Wright* does NOT even pertain to a database program used to access data stored in a database. Instead, *Wright* pertains to a system and method for completing an electronic form (*Wright,* Title). It is noted that *Wright* describes a form engine that presents a single item or question to the user and based on scripts contained in the form, presents the next item or question to the person, or beeps, or displays a massage (*Wright,* col. 3, lines 40-55). However, it is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching in *Wright* with respect to generating a report or layout for data stored in a database. Clearly, the form engine of *Wright* is used to complete a form based on input provided by the user. However, it is respectfully submitted that *Wright* does NOT teach or suggest generating a script that when executed generates a report or layout of data stored in a database.

As noted by the Examiner, *Lotus* does NOT teach automatically generating, based on an interview sequence, a script which when executed allows a report or layout to be automatically generated (Final Office Action, page 4). As such, it is believed to be apparent that *Lotus* also fails to teach or suggest determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout during an interview sequence. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 17 and 31 are patentable over the cited art for at least this reason.

**(iii) The combination of *Lotus* and *Wright* do NOT teach or suggest: automatically generating, based on an interview sequence, a script which when executed allows a report or layout to be automatically generated for data stored in a database, when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has noted that *Lotus* does NOT teach this feature (Final Office Action, page 4). However, the Examiner has asserted that *Wright* teaches this feature. To support this assertion, the Examiner has noted that *Wright* teaches using a "Design menu for creating form fields," "when the user is prompt for a field type, the user can select Script because the form will fill in automatically using the script" and; "the script running under the form engine which controls the form execution to automatically guide a user through the form." (Final Office Action, page 4).

It is noted that the "field scripts" of *Wright* are used to navigate an electronic form (*Wright,* Col. 9, 11-12). It is further noted that execution of an electronic form can be

driven by a field script written in a scripting language, and the scripts can provide common survey functionality such as data validation, field navigation, context sensitive help, data formatting, alert sounds, and dialog boxes (*Wright,* col. 9, 14-19). However, as will be discussed below, completing an electronic form using the field scripts of *Wright* does NOT teach or even remotely suggest automatically generating, based on an interview sequence, a script which when executed allows a report or layout of data stored in a database to be automatically generated based on the same interview sequence.

**(iii-a) The field script of *Wright* is NOT a script that when executed allows a report or layout of a database to be automatically generated.**

Firstly, the field script of *Wright* is NOT a script that when executed allows a report or layout of a database to be automatically generated. The field script of *Wright* is a script for a field in an electronic form (*Wright,* col. 9, lines 14-17). Clearly, the field script of *Wright* facilitates creation of an electronic form in that "the execution of the form is driven by field scripts written in a scripting language supporting flow of control statements such as IF/THEN/ELSE..." (*Wright,* col. 9, lines 14-17). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the field script of *Wright* is NOT a script that can be executed to generate a report or layout of data stored in a database. Rather, the scripting feature of *Wright* provides flow of control statements and other functions useful in forms, e.g., such as questionnaires (*Wright*, Abstract).

**(iii-b) *Wright* does NOT teach or even remotely suggest generating any type of scripts, even field scripts, based on an interview sequence**

Secondly, it is respectfully submitted that the field script of *Wright* is NOT generated based on an interview sequence. In fact, *Wright* does NOT even remotely suggest generating any type of scripts, even field scripts, based on an interview sequence. As noted above, the field script of *Wright* is there to implement a survey function used to generate an electronic form based on user responses. Clearly, the field script of *Wright* itself, however, is NOT generated based on an interview sequence. In other words, the script is NOT generated based on user input. Instead, as noted by the Examiner, the script guides a user through the form (Final Office Action, page 4)

***(iii-c) Wright* CANNOT possibly teach or suggest this claimed features because *Wright* does NOT even pertain to a method for creating a report or a layout for data stored in a database**

Finally, it is respectfully submitted that *Wright* cannot possibly teach or even remotely suggest this feature because *Wright* does NOT even pertain to a method for creating a report or a layout for data stored in a database. In fact, *Wright* does not even pertain to a database program. Instead, *Wright* pertains to a system and method for completing an electronic form (*Wright,* Title). It is noted that *Wright* describes a form engine that presents a single item or question to the user and based on scripts contained in the form, presents the next item or question to the person, or beeps, or displays a massage (*Wright,* col. 3, lines 40-55*)*. However, there is NO teaching in *Wright* with respect to generating a report or layout for data stored in a database. Clearly, the form engine of *Wright* is used to complete a form based on input provided by the user. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Wright* cannot possibly teach or suggest generating a script that when executed generates a report or layout of data stored in a database.

Therefore, for at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art does NOT render the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 31, and their dependent claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**B) Rejection of Claims 39-43 under 35 USC §103(a):**

Claims 39-43 have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Lotus* in view of *Wright* and *Meadhra*. This rejection is fully traversed below.

All of the additional features which recited in the dependent claim 39-43 have been rejected in the Final Office Action based on a general allegation that "*Meahhra* on pages 240-252 teaches and shows the creation of a report using a Report Assistant and wherein a typical report is seen in a Design view (page 246, see Figure 15-9) showing more than one Leading summary, Body, and the Trailing summary right next to the Totals." (Final Office Action, page 12).

In addition, in the Advisory Action dated September 20, 2004, the Examiner has noted that if a report has more than one summary, these summaries can also be

considered sub-summaries (see, Figure 15-9 of *Meadhra*). The undersigned very respectfully disagrees.

However, even assuming purely for the sake of argument that more than one summary can be regarded as sub-summaries, the Examiner has NOT even alleged that these the multiple occurrences of leading and trailing summaries have been generated based on an interview sequence. As such, it is very respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to address the claimed features by failing to even allege that the multiple occurrences of leading and trailing summaries have been generated based on an interview sequence. Moreover, it is very respectfully submitted that there is no evidence in Figure 15-9 of *Meadhra* that the multiple occurrences of leading and trailing summaries have been generated based on an interview sequence.

Furthermore, it should be noted that Figure 10D of the present application depicts a representative layout arrangement for a report with grouped data and subtotal and grand totals. In contrast, Fig 10A depicts a representative layout arrangement for a report without any subtotals or grand totals. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the distinction between a summary (or total) and a sub-summary (or sub-total) generated in a report which has been particularly recited in the claimed invention has been illustrated in some cases a sub-summary.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 39-43 under §103(a) which is improper for failing to even address the specific claimed features. Nevertheless, a number of features of claims 39-42 which are neither taught or suggested by the cited art are discussed below.

**(i) *Lotus*, *Wright* and *Meadhra* do NOT teach or suggest determining during the interview sequence whether: (a) a leading grand total, (b) a leading sub-summary, (c) a trailing sub-summary, and (d) a trailing grand total should be generated for the layout or report** (claim 39)

In the Final office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Meadhra* shows "more than one Leading summary, Body, and a Trailing summary next to the totals" (Final Office Action, page 12). It is noted that Fig. 15.9 of *Meadhra* shows more than one leading summary and more than one trailing summary (*Meadhra,* page 246). Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has NOT even addressed the claimed features of: (b) a leading sub-summary and (c) a trailing sub-summary. Instead, the

Examiner has merely asserted that more than one Leading summary and Trailing summary are shown by *Meadhra*. The claimed invention, however, does not recite: more than one Leading summary and more than one Trailing summary. The claimed invention recites: (a) a leading grand total, (b) a leading sub-summary, (c) a trailing sub-summary, and (d) a trailing grand. Clearly, the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn because it does NOT address at least two features of the claimed invention, namely, a leading sub-summary and a trailing sub-summary.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertion is improper because it does NOT address: determining during an interview sequence whether these components (a-d above) should be generated for a layout or report (see, also, claim 39). The mere assertion that one or all of these features are shown in a report does NOT address the claimed feature of generating them based on an interview sequence. Thus, the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn for additional reasons.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Meadhra* does NOT teach or suggest determining during the interview sequence whether one or more of: a leading grand total, a leading sub-summary, a trailing sub-summary, and a trailing grand total should be generated for the layout or report (claim 39). As such, *Meadhra* cannot possibly teach or suggest generating these reports or layout components when it is determined during the interview that one or more component should be generated. The deficiency of *Meadhra* is believed to be evident because the report assistant described in the tutorials of *Meadhra* does NOT allow generation of leading or trailing sub-summaries based on an interview sequence.

**(ii) *Lotus, Wright* and Meadhra do NOT teach or suggest several other features of the claimed invention**

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not addressed the feature of: determing during the interview sequence whether a leading grand total, leading sub-summary, a trailing sub-summary, and a trailing grand total should be generated for the layout or report (Claim 40). Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art does NOT teach or suggest this feature.

It is respectfully submitted that several other features of the claimed invention have NOT been addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. These features

include: (a) determining based on the interview sequence whether the report or layout should include a body, (b) placing the grand total in a leftmost position in a grand total area when it is determined that report or layout should not include a body, (c) determining based on said interview whether the grand total to be placed is dependent on a field to be placed in the report or layout, (d) placing the grand total in a grand total area based on the placement of the field to be placed when it is determined that grand total to be placed is dependent on a field to be placed, and (e) placing the grand total in a leftmost position in a grand total area in the report or layout when it is determined that grand total to be placed is not dependent on a field to be placed (claim 41).

Additional features which have NOT been addressed by the Examiner include: (a) determining based on the interview sequence whether placement of a leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body of the report or layout only when it is determined based on said interview that the report or layout should include a body, and (c) placing the leading or trailing sub-summary in a sub-summary area in the report or layout based on the placement of the field that is to be placed in the body when it is determined based on the interview sequence that the placement of the leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body (claim 42).

Yet additional features which have NOT been addressed by the Examiner include: (a) determining based on the interview sequence whether placement of a leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in a position other than the body only when it is determined based on said interview that the report or layout should include a body; and (b) placing the leading or trailing sub-summary in a sub-summary area in the report or layout based on the placement of the field that is to be placed in a position other than the body in the report or layout when it is determined based on the interview sequence that the placement of the leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body (claim 43).

**C) Cross Reference to the Related Application Section in the Specification**:

It is respectfully submitted that application number of the related Application 09/378,599 has been provided in the After Final Amendment dated July 22, 2004. It is very respectfully requested that the Examiner enter the Amendment to the specification.

**D) Conclusion:**

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that none of the pending claims are anticipated or reasonably suggested by the cited art and that the Examiner's rejections of the pending claims were erroneous. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the pending rejections of all of the claims be reversed.

Respectfully Submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, California 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300

## VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

### CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. (Previously Presented) A method for creating a report or layout for data stored in a database, said method comprising:

(a) performing an interview sequence, by a database program, to obtain organization information associated with the database, the organization information including at least a list of fields defined for the database and at least one summary field for the report or layout, the at least one summary field being associated with at least one of the fields in the list of field, wherein the database program is capable of accessing the data stored in the database, and wherein the interview sequence comprises determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout; and

(b) automatically creating, by the database program, the report or layout based on the organization information obtained by the database program through the interview sequence, wherein the database program operates to automatically create the report or layout; and

(c) automatically generating the script by the database program when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated, wherein the script when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based on the interview sequence.

2. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the summary field is a subtotal or a grand total of the data in the associated fields.

3. (Original) A method as recited in claim 2, wherein the summary field provides one of a total, count, average, minimum, and maximum of the data for the field associated with the summary field.

4. (Original) A method as recited in claim 2, wherein the list of fields is an ordered list or fields.

5. (Original) A method as recited in claim 2, wherein the organization information further includes a style for the layout or report.

6. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the organization information further includes a style for the layout or report.

7. (Original) A method as recited in claim 6, wherein the style for the layout or report identifies particular characteristics for the layout or report including a plurality of background color, text size, text font, text style, and other colors.

8. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the organization information further includes header or footer information for the layout or report, the header or footer information including at least one of a logo and custom text.

9. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1,

wherein said method produces a report, and

wherein the organization information further includes a category that identifies the field on which the report is organized.

10. (Original) A method as recited in claim 9, wherein the organization information further includes a plurality of categories that are ordered, and the categories identify the fields and a hierarchy on which the report is organized.

11. (Original) A method as recited in claim 10, wherein the summary field is a subtotal or a grand total of the data in the associated fields.

12. (Original) A method as recited in claim 11, wherein the summary field provides one of a total, count, average, minimum, and maximum of the data for the field associated with the summary field.

13. (Canceled)

14. (Canceled)

15. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the organization information further includes sort fields for the report or layout.

16. (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the report or layout has a plurality of parts, the parts including header, grand total, summary, body, and footer.

17. (Previously Presented) A method for creating a report layout for data stored in a database, said method comprising:

(a) performing an interview sequence, by a database program, to obtain organization information, the organization information including at least a list of fields and at least one summary field for the report layout, the at least one summary field being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields, the report layout including a plurality of parts including a header area, a grand total area, a summary area, a body area, and a footer area, wherein the database program is capable of accessing the data stored in the database, and wherein the interview sequence comprises determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout; and

(b) automatically creating the report layout based on the interview sequence, said creating includes placing the summary field in at least one of the grand total area and the summary area, and placing the fields in the list of fields in the body area and;

(c) automatically generating the script when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated, wherein the script when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based the interview sequence.

18. (Original) A method as recited in claim 17, wherein when the summary field is a subtotal, said creating (b) places the subtotal in the summary area.

19. (Original) A method as recited in claim 18, wherein the subtotal in placed in the summary area at a position corresponding to the position as the associated one of the fields placed in the body.

20. (Original) A method as recited in claim 17, wherein the subtotal is placed in the summary area in the same column location in the report layout as the one of the fields placed in the body that corresponds thereto.

21. (Original) A method as recited in claim 17, wherein when the summary field is a grand total summary field, said creating (b) places the grand total in the grand total area.

22. (Original) A method as recited in claim 21, wherein the grand total summary field is placed in the grand total area at a position corresponding to the position as the associated one of the fields placed in the body.

23. (Original) A method as recited in claim 21, wherein the grand total summary field is placed in the grand total area in the same column location in the report layout as the one of the fields placed in the body that corresponds thereto.

24. (Canceled)

25. (Canceled)

26. (Original) A method as recited in claim 17, wherein the organization information further includes sort fields for the report or layout.

27. (Original) A method as recited in claim 26, wherein said method further comprises:

(c) producing a report for the data using the report layout.

28. (Original) A method as recited in claim 27, wherein said producing (c) sorts the data in accordance with the sort fields for the report.

29. (Original) A method as recited in claim 17, wherein the organization information further includes a theme selection for the report layout.

30. (Original) A method as recited in claim 17, wherein the organizational information includes at least first and second of summary fields, the first summary field is a grand total summary field and the second summary field is summary field, and

wherein said creating (b) of the report layout comprises:

(b1) placing the first summary field in the grand total area;

(b2) placing the second summary field in the summaries area; and

(b3) placing the fields in the list of fields in the body area.

31. (Previously Presented) A computer readable medium including computer program code for a database program that is capable of creating a report layout for data stored in a database, said computer readable medium comprising:

computer program code for performing an interview sequence to obtain organization information, the organization information including at least a list of fields, the report layout including a plurality of parts including a header area, a grand total area, a summary area, a body area, and a footer area, wherein the database program is capable of accessing the data stored in the database, and wherein the interview sequence comprises determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout ;

computer program code for creating the report layout based on the interview sequence, the creating of the report layout includes placing the fields in the list of fields in the body area; and

computer program code for automatically generating the script when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated, wherein the script when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based the interview sequence.

32. (Original) A computer readable medium as recited in claim 31, wherein the organization information further includes header or footer information for the layout or report, the header or footer information including at least one of a logo and custom text.

33. (Original) A computer readable medium as recited in claim 31, wherein the organization information further includes a category that identifies the field on which the report layout is organized.

34. (Original) A computer readable medium as recited in claim 31, wherein the organization information further includes a plurality of categories that are ordered, and the categories identify the fields and a hierarchy on which the report layout is organized.

35. (Canceled)

36. (Original) A computer readable medium as recited in claim 31, wherein the organizational information further includes at least one summary field for the report layout, the at least one summary field being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields, and

wherein said computer program code for creating the report layout comprises: computer program code for placing the summary field in at least one of the grand total area and the summary area and placing the fields in the list of fields in the body area.

37. (Original) A computer readable medium as recited in claim 36, wherein the summary field is a subtotal or a grand total of the data in the associated fields.

38. (Original) A computer readable medium as recited in claim 37, wherein the summary field provides one of a total, count, average, minimum, and maximum of the data for the field associated with the summary field.

39. (Previously Presented) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the interview sequence further comprises:

determining during the interview sequence whether one or more of: a leading grand total, a leading sub-summary, a trailing sub-summary, and a trailing grand total should be generated for the layout or report; and

generating one or more of: the leading grand total, the leading sub-summary, the trailing sub-summary and the trailing grand total when it is determined during the interview that one or more of: the leading grand total, the leading sub-summary, and the trailing grand total, the trailing sub-summary should be generated.

40. (Previously Presented) A method as recited in claim 1,

wherein the interview sequence further comprises: determining during the interview sequence whether a leading grand total, a leading sub-summary, a trailing sub-summary, and a trailing grand total should be generated for the layout or report; and

generating the leading grand total only when it is determined during the interview sequence that the leading grand total should be generated;

generating the leading sub-summary only when it is determined during the interview sequence that the leading sub-summary should be generated;

generating the trailing sub-summary only when it is determined during the interview sequence that the trailing sub-summary should be generated; and

generating trailing grand total only when it is determined during the interview sequence that the trailing grand total should be generated.

41. (Previously Presented) A method as recited in claim 40, wherein said method further comprises:

determining based on the interview sequence whether the report or layout should include a body;

placing the grand total in a leftmost position in a grand total area when the determining determines that report or layout should not include a body;

determining based on said interview whether the grand total to be placed is dependent on a field to be placed in the report or layout;

placing the grand total in a grand total area based on the placement of the field to be placed when the determining determines that grand total to be placed is dependent on a field to be placed; and

placing the grand total in a leftmost position in a grand total area in the report or layout when said determining determines that that grand total to be placed is not dependent on a field to be placed.

42. (Previously Presented) A method as recited in claim 41, wherein said method further comprises:

determining based on the interview sequence whether placement of a leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body of the report or layout only when the determining determines based on said interview that the report or layout should include a body; and

placing the leading or trailing sub-summary in a sub-summary area in the report or layout based on the placement of the field that is to be placed in the body when said determining determines based on the interview sequence that the placement of the leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body.

43. (Previously Presented) A method as recited in claim 42, wherein said method further comprises:

determining based on the interview sequence whether placement of a leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in a position other than the body only when the determining determines based on said interview that the report or layout should include a body; and

placing the leading or trailing sub-summary in a sub-summary area in the report or layout based on the placement of the field that is to be placed in a position other than the body in the report or layout when said determining determines based on the interview sequence that the placement of the leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body.